REMARKS

Claims 1-37 remain in the application. Claims 1 and 20 are amended.

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The office action dated May 5, 2003 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

In the Office Action, claims 1-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the related art disclosed in the patent application (hereinafter "related") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,344,883 to Yamada et al. (hereinafter "Yamada").

The rejection of claim 1 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claim 1 is allowable over the cited references in that this claim recites a combination of elements including, for example, "a dielectric protrusion extending from the first substrate to the second substrate". None of the cited references including the related art and Yamada, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. The Examiner identifies item 69 in FIG. 15 in Yamada as the dielectric protrusion, but the protrusion in Yamada does not extend from the first substrate to the second substrate as in claim 1. This protrusion only extends from one substrate part of the way to the other substrate. Therefore, the structure of claim 1 of the present invention is different from the structure of Yamada. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and claims 2-19, which depend from claim 1, are allowable over the cited references.

The rejection of claim 20 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claim 20 is allowable over the cited references in that this claim recites a combination of elements including, for example, "a third insulating protrusion between the first and second insulating protrusions and acting as a spacer extending from the first substrate to the second substrate". None of the cited references including the related art and Yamada, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. The Examiner identifies item 69 in FIG. 15 in Yamada as the dielectric protrusion, but the protrusion in Yamada does not extend from the first substrate to the second substrate as in claim 20. This

U.S. Application No. 09/604,796 Amendment dated August 5, 2003 Reply to Office Action of May 5, 2003

protrusion only extends from one substrate part of the way to the other substrate. Therefore, the structure of claim 20 of the present invention is different from the structure of Yamada. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 20 and claims 21-37, which depend from claim 20, are allowable over the cited references.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE

у <u>Д</u>

Registration No.: 40,106

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant